arXiv:1109.4924v1 [math.FA] 22 Sep 2011

Properties of extremal sequences for the Bellman function of the dyadic maximal operator

Eleftherios N. Nikolidakis

Abstract: We prove a necessary condition that has every extremal sequence for the Bellman function of the dyadic maximal operator. This implies the weak-L^p uniqueness for such a sequence.

1. Introduction

The dyadic maximal operator on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{M}_d\phi(x) = \sup\left\{\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q |\phi(u)u : x \in Q,\ Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \text{ is a dyadic cube}\right\} \tag{1.1}$$

for every $\phi \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $|\cdot|$ is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and the dyadic cubes are those formed by the grids $2^{-N}\mathbb{Z}^n$, $N = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$.

It is well known that it satisfies the following weak type (1.1) inequality:

$$|\{x \in \mathbb{R}^b : \mathcal{M}_d\phi(x) \geq \lambda\}| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_{\{\mathcal{M}_d\phi \geq \lambda\}} |\phi(u)|du, \tag{1.2}$$

for every $\phi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\lambda > 0$.

From (1.2) it is easy to prove the following L^p-inequality

$$\|\mathcal{M}_d\phi\|_p \leq \frac{p}{p-1}\|\phi\|_p. \tag{1.3}$$

It is easy to see that (1.2) is best possible, while (1.3) is sharp as it can be seen in [5]. (See also [1] and [2] for general martingales).

A way of studying the dyadic maximal operator is to find certain refinements of inequalities satisfied for it.

In this direction the Bellman function of two variables for $p > 1$, has been introduced by the following way:

$$T_p(f,F) = \sup\left\{\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q (\mathcal{M}_d\phi)^p : \phi \geq 0,\ \frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q \phi(u)du = f,\right.$$
$$\left.\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q \phi^p(u)du = F\right\} \tag{1.4}$$

where Q is a fixed dyadic cube on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $0 < f^p \leq F$.

The function given in (1.4) has been explicitely computed. Actually, this is done in a much more general setting of a non-atomic probability measure space (X,μ) where the dyadic sets are now given in a family of sets $\mathcal{T}$, called tree, which satisfies conditions similar to those that are satisfied by the dyadic cubes on $[0,1]^n$.

Then the associated dyadic maximal operator $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi(x) = \sup\left\{\frac{1}{\mu(I)}\int_I |\phi| d\mu : x \in I \in \mathcal{T}\right\}, \tag{1.5}$$

where $\phi \in L^1(X,\mu)$.

Then the Bellman function (for a given $p > 1$) of two variables associated to $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}$ is then given by

$$S_p(f,F) = \sup\left\{\int_X (\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi)^p d\mu : \phi \geq 0,\ \int_X \phi d\mu = f,\ \int_X \phi^p d\mu = F\right\}, \tag{1.6}$$

where $0 < f^p \leq F$.

In [4], (1.6) has been found to be $S_p(f,F) = F\omega_p(f^p/F)^p$ where $\omega_p : [0,1] \to \left[1, \frac{p}{p-1}\right]$ is the inverse function H_p^{-1} of H_p defined on $\left[1, \frac{p}{p-1}\right]$ by $H_p(z) = -(p-1)z^p + pz^{p-1}$.

As a result the Bellman function is independent of the measure space (X,μ) and the underlying tree $\mathcal{T}$.

In this paper we study those sequences of functions: $(\phi_n)_n$, that are extremal for the Bellman function (1.6). That is $\phi_n : (X,\mu) \to \mathbb{R}^+$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$ satisfy $\int_X \phi_n d\mu = f$, $\int_X \phi_n^p d\mu = F$ and

$$\lim_n \int_X (\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi_n)^p d\mu = F\omega_p(f^p/F)^p. \tag{1.7}$$

In Section 3 we prove the following

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\phi_n : (X,\mu) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be as above. Then for every $I \in \mathcal{T}$,*

$$\lim_n \frac{1}{\mu(I)}\int_I \phi_n d\mu = f \quad \textit{and} \quad \lim_n \frac{1}{\mu(I)}\int_I \phi_n^p d\mu = F. \tag{1.8}$$

Additionally:

$$\lim_n \frac{1}{\mu(I)} \int_I (\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi_n)^p d\mu = F\omega_p(f^p/F)^p,$$

for every $I \in \mathcal{T}$. □

This gives as an immediate result that extremal functions do not exist for the Bellman function. Another corollary is the weak-L^p uniqueness of such a sequence in all interesting cases. In other words if $(\phi_n)_n$, $(g_n)_n$ are extremal sequences for (1.4), then $\lim_n \int_Q (\phi_n - g_n) h d\mu = 0$, for every $h \in L^p(Q)$, where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$.

Then the following questions arise naturally:

Question 1: Is an extremal sequence strong L^p-unique. By this we mean that we ask the following:

Let $(\phi_n)_n, (g_n)_n$ be extremal sequences. Does it hold that

$$\lim_n \int_X |\phi_n - g_n|^p d\mu = 0\,?$$

□

Additionally we mention that (1.8) is not sufficient for a sequence $(\varphi_n)_n$ to be extremal. So we may ask the following:

Question 2: Are there any necessary additional conditions that together with (1.8) guarantee the extemality of the sequence $(\phi_n)_n$? □

In these questions we hope to answer in the near future.

2. Extremal sequences

Let (X, μ) be a non-atomic probability measure space. We give the following

Definition 2.1. *A set* $\mathcal{T}$ *of measurable subsets of* X *will be called a tree if the following are satisfied:*

i) $X \in \mathcal{T}$ *and for every* $I \in \mathcal{T}$, $\mu(I) > 0$.

ii) For every $I \in \mathcal{T}$ *there corresponds a finite or countable subset* $C(I)$ *of* $\mathcal{T}$ *containing at least two elements such that*

(a) the elements of $C(I)$ *are disjoint subsets of* I

(b) $I = \cup C(I)$

iii) $\mathcal{T} = \bigcup_{m \geq 0} \mathcal{T}_{(m)}$, *where* $\mathcal{T}_{(0)} = \{X\}$ *and*

$$\mathcal{T}_{(m+1)} = \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{T}_{(m)}} C(I).$$

iv) The following holds $\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{I \in \mathcal{T}_{(m)}} \mu(I) = 0.$ ☐

Definition 2.2. *Given a tree* $\mathcal{T}$ *we define the maximal operator associated to it as follows:*

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi(x) = \sup\left\{ \frac{1}{\mu(I)} \int_I |\phi| d\mu : x \in I \in \mathcal{T} \right\}$$

for every $\phi \in L^1(X, \mu)$. ☐

From [4] we obtain the following:

Theorem 2.1. *The following holds*

$$\sup\left\{ \int_X (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi)^p d\mu : \phi \geq 0, \int \phi d\mu = f, \int_X \phi^p d\mu = F \right\} = F\omega_p(f^p/F)^p,$$

for $0 < f^p \leq F$. ☐

At last we give the following

Definition 2.3. *Let* $(\phi_n)_n$ *be a sequence of non-negative measurable functions defined on* X *and* $0 < f^p \leq F$, $p > 1$. $(\phi_n)_n$ *is called* (p, f, F) *extremal, or simply extremal if the following hold:*

$$\int_X \phi_n d\mu = f, \int_X \phi_n^p d\mu = F, \quad \textit{for every} \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots$$

$$\lim_n \int_X (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi_n)^p d\mu = F\omega_p(f^p/F)^p.$$

3. Main theorem

Theorem 3.1. *Let* $(\phi_n)_n$ *be an extremal sequence. Then for every* $I \in \mathcal{T}$ *the following hold:*

i) $\lim_n \frac{1}{\mu(I)} \int_I \phi_n d\mu = f$

ii) $\lim_n \frac{1}{\mu(I)} \int_I \phi_n^p d\mu = F$

iii) $\lim \frac{1}{\mu(I)} \int_I (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi_n)^p d\mu = F\omega_p(f^p/F)^p$.

Proof. We remind that $\mathcal{T}_{(0)} = \{X\}$ and $\mathcal{T} = \bigcup_{m\geq 0} \mathcal{T}_{(m)}$. We prove this theorem for $I \in \mathcal{T}_{(1)}$. Then inductively it holds for every $I \in \mathcal{T}_{(m)}$, $m \geq 1$.

Suppose then that $\mathcal{T}_{(1)} = \{I_k,\ k = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ and $I = I_1$. We now set

$$f_n^1 = \frac{1}{\mu(I_1)} \int_{I_1} \phi_n d\mu, \quad f_n^2 = \frac{1}{\mu(X \smallsetminus I_1)} \int_{X \smallsetminus I_1} \phi_n d\mu,$$

$$F_n^1 = \frac{1}{\mu(I_1)} \int_{I_1} \phi_n^p d\mu, \quad F_n^2 = \frac{1}{\mu(X \smallsetminus I_1)} \int_{X \smallsetminus I_1} \phi_n^p d\mu, \quad \text{for} \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots, \tag{3.1}$$

The above sequences are obviously bounded, so passing to a subsequence we may suppose that

$$\lim_n f_n^i = f^i \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_n F_n^i = F^i, \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2.$$

For any $J \in \mathcal{T}$ define

$$\mathcal{M}_J \phi(t) = \sup\left\{ \frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K |\phi| d\mu : t \in K \in \mathcal{T}_J \right\}, \quad \text{for} \quad t \in J,$$

where $\mathcal{T}_J$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{T}_J = \{K \in \mathcal{T} : K \subseteq J\}.$$

Consider the measure space $\left(J, \frac{\mu(\cdot)}{\mu(J)}\right)$, the tree $\mathcal{T}_J$ and the associated maximal operator $\mathcal{M}_J$. Then using Theorem 1.1, we have that

$$\frac{1}{\mu(J)} \int_J (\mathcal{M}_J \phi)^p d\mu \leq \frac{1}{\mu(J)} \int_J \phi^p d\mu \cdot \omega_p \left(\frac{\left(\frac{1}{\mu(J)} \int_J \phi d\mu\right)^p}{\frac{1}{\mu(J)} \int_J \phi^p d\mu} \right)^p \tag{3.2}$$

for every $\phi \in L^p(J)$, where $\omega_p : [0,1] \to \left[1, \frac{p}{p-1I}\right]$ is H_p^{-1}, with

$$H_p(z) = -(p-1)z^p + pz^{p-1}, \quad z \in \left[1, \frac{p}{p-1}\right].$$

(3.2) now gives (since H_p is decreasing) we have that

$$H_p\left(\left[\frac{\int_J (\mathcal{M}_J \phi)^\mu}{\int_J \phi^p d\mu} \right]^{1/p} \right) \geq \frac{1}{\mu(J)^{p-1}} \frac{\left(\int_J \phi d\mu\right)^p}{\int_J \phi^p d\mu},$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} -(p-1) \int_J (\mathcal{M}_J \phi)^p d\mu + p\Big(\int_J \phi^p d\mu \Big)^{1/p} \cdot \Big(\int_J (\mathcal{M}_J \phi)^p d\mu \Big)^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \\ = \frac{1}{\mu(J)^{p-1}} \Big(\int_J \phi d\mu \Big)^p + \delta_{\phi,J}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

for some $\delta_{\phi,J} \geq 0$ positive constant depending on ϕ and J.

For $\phi = \phi_n$ and $J = I_i$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ we obtain from (3.3)

$$-(p-1)\int_{I_i}(\mathcal{M}_{I_i}\phi_n)^p d\mu + p\Big(\int_{I_i}\phi_n^p d\mu\Big)^{1/p}\cdot\Big(\int_{I_i}(\mathcal{M}_{I_i}\phi_n)^p d\mu\Big)^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$$
$$= \frac{1}{\mu(I_i)^{p-1}}\Big(\int_{I_i}\phi_n d\mu\Big)^p + \delta_{n,i}, \quad \text{for every} \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots \quad \text{and} \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots . \tag{3.4}$$

Summing relations (3.4) for $i \geq 2$ we obtain

$$-(p-1)\sum_{i=2}^{+\infty}\int_{I_i}(\mathcal{M}_{I_i}\phi_n)^p d\mu + p\sum_{i=2}^{+\infty}\Big(\int_{I_i}\phi_n^p d\mu\Big)^{1/p}\Big(\int_{I_i}(\mathcal{M}_{I_i}\phi_n)^p d\mu\Big)^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$$
$$= \sum_{i=2}^{+\infty}\frac{1}{\mu(I_i)^{p-1}}\Big(\int_{I_i}\phi_n d\mu\Big)^p + \sum_{i=2}^{+\infty}\delta_{n,i}. \tag{3.5}$$

In view now of Holder's inequality in its primitive form:

$$\sum_i a_i b_i \leq \Big(\sum_i a_i^p\Big)^{1/p}\Big(\sum_i b_i^q\Big)^{1/q},$$

for $a_i, b_i \geq 0$ and $q = p/p-1$, (3.5) gives

$$-(p-1)A_2(n) + p\Big(\int_{X\setminus I_1}\phi_n^p d\mu\Big)^{1/p}\cdot\big[A_2(n)\big]^{1-\frac{1}{p}}$$
$$\geq \sum_{i=2}^{+\infty}\frac{1}{\mu(I_i)^{p-1}}\Big(\int_{I_i}\phi_n d\mu\Big)^p + \sum_{i=2}^{+\infty}\delta_{n,i}, \quad \text{where} \tag{3.6}$$

$$A_2(n) = \sum_{i=2}^{+\infty}\int_{I_i}(\mathcal{M}_{I_i}\phi_n)^p d\mu. \tag{3.7}$$

(In the last inequality we used the fact that $X \setminus I_1 = \bigcup_{i=2}^{+\infty} I_i$).

We use now Holder's inequality in the following form:

$$\frac{(\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\cdots+\lambda_m)^p}{(\sigma_1+\sigma_2+\cdots+\sigma_m)^{p-1}} \leq \frac{\lambda_1^p}{\sigma_1^{p-1}} + \frac{\lambda_2^p}{\sigma_2^{p-1}} + \cdots + \frac{\lambda_m^p}{\sigma_m^{p-1}},$$

where σ_i, $\forall\, i = 11, 2, \ldots$ and $\lambda_i \geq 0$, and obtain:

$$\sum_{i=2}^{+\infty}\frac{1}{\mu(I_i)^{p-1}}\Big(\int_{I_i}\phi_n \mu\Big)^p \geq \frac{1}{\mu(X\setminus I_1)^{p-1}}\Big(\int_{X\setminus I_1}\phi_n d\mu\Big)^p = \mu(X\setminus I_1)f_n^2. \tag{3.8}$$

We also set

$$A_3(n) = \int_{X\setminus I_1}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi_n)^p d\mu, \quad \text{for} \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots . \tag{3.9}$$

Then by definition of $\mathcal{M}_{I_i}$ we have that

$$A_3(n) \geq A_2(n). \tag{3.10}$$

From the above we have then that:

$$-(p-1)A_2(n) + p\mu(X \smallsetminus I_1)^{1/p}(F_n^2)^{1/p}[A_3(n)]^{1-\frac{1}{p}} = \mu(X \smallsetminus I_i)(f_n^2)^p + \delta_n^{(1)}, \tag{3.11}$$

where $\delta_n^{(1)} \geq \sum\limits_{i=2}^{+\infty} \delta_{n,i}$.

By passing to a subsequence we may suppose that $\lim\limits_n A_3(n) = A_3$.

We will use now the following Lemma, the proof of which will be given at the end of this section.

Lemma 3.1. *If $(\phi_n)_n$ is extremal then we have that*

$$\lim_n \mu(\{\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi_n = f\}) = 0.$$

□

From this Lemma and Definitions (3.7) and (3.9) we easily obtain that $\lim\limits_n A_2(n) = \lim\limits_n A_3(n) = A_3$, in view of the fact that $I \in \mathcal{T}_{(1)}$ for $i = 2, 3, \ldots$. (3.11) now becomes

$$\begin{aligned}-(p-1)\int_{X\smallsetminus I_1}(\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi_n)^p d\mu + p\mu(X \smallsetminus I_1)^{1/p}(F_n^2)^{1/p}\Big(\int_{X\smallsetminus I_1}(\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi_n)^p d\mu\Big)^{1-\frac{1}{p}}\\ = \mu(X \smallsetminus I_i)(f_n^2)^p + \delta_n'',\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where $|\delta_n'' - \delta_n'| \to 0$, as $n \to +\infty$.

In the same way we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}-(p-1)\int_{I_1}(\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi_n)^p d\mu + p\mu(I_1)^{1/p}(F_n^1)^{1/p}\cdot\Big(\int_{I_1}(\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi_n)^p d\mu\Big)^{1-\frac{1}{p}}\\ = \mu(I_1)(f_n^1)^p + \varepsilon_n'',\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

where ε_n'' is such that $|\varepsilon_n'' - \varepsilon_n'| \to 0$, $n \to +\infty$ for some sequence ε_n' for which $\varepsilon_n' \geq \delta_{n,1}$.

Summing now (3.12) and (3.13) and using Holder's inequality in both previously mentioned forms we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}-(p-1)\int_X(\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi_n)^p d\mu + pF^{1/p}\Big(\int_X(\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi_n)^p d\mu\Big)^{1-\frac{1}{p}}\\ \geq \mu(I_1)(f_n^1)^p + \mu(X \smallsetminus I_1)(f_n^2)^p + \delta_n'' + \varepsilon_n'' \geq f^p + \delta_n'' + \varepsilon_n'',\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

which gives

$$-(p-1)\int_X (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi_1)^p d\mu + pF^{1/p}\bigg(\int_X (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi_n)^p d\mu\bigg)^{1-\frac{1}{p}} = f^p + \vartheta_n, \tag{3.15}$$

where $\vartheta_n \geq \delta''_n + \varepsilon''_n$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$.

The hypothesis now for (ϕ_n) is that

$$\lim_n \int_X (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi_n)^p d\mu = F\omega_p(f^p/F)^p.$$

This gives $\vartheta_n \ \rightarrow \ 0$ in (3.15), so

$$\lim_n \delta'_n + \lim \varepsilon'_n \leq 0 \Rightarrow \delta'_n \ \rightarrow \ 0, \ \varepsilon'_n \ \rightarrow \ 0, \ \delta''_n \ \rightarrow \ 0, \ \varepsilon''_n \ \rightarrow \ 0.$$

As a consequence we have

$$\mu(I_1)(f^1)^p + \mu(X \setminus I_1)(f^2)^p = f^p$$

because of equality in (3.14), as $n \ \rightarrow \ +\infty$.

Since now $\mu(I_1)f^1 + \mu(X \setminus I_1)f^2 = f$ and $t \mapsto t^p$ is strictly convex on $(0, +\infty)$ we have that $f^1 = f^2 = f$.

Since now $\delta''_n \ \rightarrow \ 0$, we have because of (3.12) and $f^2 = f$ that

$$\lim_n \frac{1}{\mu(X \setminus I_1)} \int_{X \setminus I_1} (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi_n)^p d\mu = F_2\omega_p(f^p/F_2)^p. \tag{3.16}$$

Similarly

$$\lim_n \frac{1}{\mu(I_1)} \int_{I_1} (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi_n)^p d\mu = F_1\omega_p(f^p/F_1)^p. \tag{3.17}$$

Since $(\phi_n)_n$ is extremal the last two equations give

$$\mu(I_1) \cdot F_1\omega_p(f^p/F_1)^p + \mu(X \setminus I_1) \cdot F_2\omega_p(f^p/F_2)^p = F\omega(f^[/F). \tag{3.18}$$

But as we shall prove in Lemma 3.2 below the following function $t \mapsto t\omega_p(f^p/t)^p$, $t \in (f^p, +\infty)$ is strictly concave. So since $\mu(I_1)F_1 + \mu(X \setminus I_1)F_2 = F$ we have because of (3.18) that $F_1 = F_2 = F$ and because of (3.17):

$$\lim_n \frac{1}{\mu(I)} \int_I (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}}\phi_n)^p d\mu = F\omega_p(f^p/F)^p,$$

and Theorem 3.1 is now proved. □.

We prove now the following

Lemma 3.2. *Let* $G : (1, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ *defined by* $G(t) = t\omega_p(1/t)^p$. *Then* G *is strictly concave.*

Proof. It is known from [4] that ω_p satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dx}[\omega_p(x)]^p = -\frac{1}{p-1}\frac{\omega_p(x)}{\omega_p(x)-1}, \quad x \in [0,1].$$

So we can easily see that

$$G'(t) = \omega_p(1/t)^p + \frac{1}{p-1}\frac{1}{t}\frac{\omega_p(1/t)}{\omega_p(1/t)-1}, \quad \text{and}$$

$$G''(t) = \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{t}\left(\frac{g(t)}{g(t)-1}\right)',$$

where g is defined on $(1, +\infty)$ by $g(t) = \omega_p(1/t)$. Since $g'(t) > 0$, $\forall\, t > 1$, we have that $G''(t) < 0$, $\forall\, t > 1$ and Lemma 3.2 is proved. $\square$

We continue now with

Proof of Lemma 3.1: Let us suppose first that ϕ_n are $\mathcal{T}$-simple functions that is for every n, there exists a m_n such that ϕ_n is constant on each $I \in \mathcal{T}_{(m_n)}$. That is ϕ_n is $\mathcal{T}$-good in the sense of [4], for every n. If we look at the proof of Lemma 9 in [4] p. 324-326 we see that in all inequalities (4.20), (4.22), (4.23), (4.24) we should have equality in the limit. So as a result we must have that $\frac{1}{(\beta+1-\beta\rho_x^n)^{p-1}} - \frac{(p-1)\beta\rho_x^n}{(\beta+1)^p} \to \frac{1}{(\beta+1)^{p-1}}$, for $\beta = \omega_p(f^p/F) - 1$, where $\rho_x^n = \frac{a_x^n}{\mu(x)} = a_x^n$, where $a_x^n = \mu(\{\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi_n = f\})$. But this can happen only if $a_x^n \to 0$. So the proof is completed in the case of $\mathcal{T}$-simple functions. As for the general case, it is not difficult to see that if $(\phi_n)_n$ is an extremal sequence of measurable functions, then we can construct a sequence of $\mathcal{T}$-simple functions such that $\int_X g_n d\mu = f$, $\int_X g_n^p d\mu \le F$ and

$$\lim_n \int_X g_n^p d\mu = F, \quad \lim_n \int_X (\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi_n)^p d\mu = F\omega_p(f^p/F)^p.$$

Additionally, we can arrange every thing in such a way that $\{\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi_n = f\} \subseteq \{\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}g_n = f\}$.

Using the same arguments as before for $(g_n)_n$ we can prove that $\lim_n \mu(\{\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}g_n = f\}) = 0$. So $\lim_n \mu(\{\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{T}\phi_n = f\}) = 0$ and Lemma 3.1 is proved. $\square$

We now give some applications of the above.

First we prove the following

Corollary 3.1. *If* $0 < f^p < F$ *then there do not exist extremal functions for the Bellman function* $\mathcal{T}_p(f, F)$ *described in (1.4).*

Proof. Let ϕ be an extremal function for (1.4). Applying Theorem 3.1 we see that

$$\frac{1}{\mu(I)}\int_I \phi d\mu = f \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\mu(I)}\int_I \phi^p d\mu = F,$$

for every I dyadic subcube of Q.

As we can see in [3] inequality (1.2) implies that the base of dyadic sets of the tree $\mathcal{T}$ differentiates $L^1(Q)$. That is

$$\begin{aligned} &\phi(x) = f \ \text{ a.e} \quad \text{and} \\ &\phi^p(x) = F \ \text{ -a.e.} \end{aligned}$$

This gives $f^p = F$, which is a contradiction. ☐

We also prove

Corollary 3.2. *Let $T_p(f, F)$ be described by (1.4). Then if $(\phi_n)_n$, $(g_n)_n$ are extremal sequences for this function, we must have $\phi_n - g_n \overset{w(L^p)}{\longrightarrow} 0$, on $\mathbb{R}^n$ as $n \to +\infty$.*

Proof. Of course we have that

$$\lim_n \frac{1}{|I|}\int_I \phi_n(u)du = \lim_n \frac{1}{|I|}\int_I g_n(u)du = f.$$

So $\lim_n \int_Q (\phi_n - g_n)\xi_I(u)du = 0$, for every dyadic subcube $I \subseteq Q$.

Since linear combinations of the characteristic functions of the dyadic subcubes of Q are dense in $L^q(Q)$ we should have that $\lim_n \int_Q (\phi_n - g_n)h = 0$, for every $h \in L^q(Q)$, that is $\phi_n - g_n \overset{w(L^p)}{\longrightarrow} 0$, as $n \to +\infty$. ☐

References

[1] D. L. Burkholder, Martingales and Fourier analysis in Banach spaces, C.I.M.E. Lectures Varenna, Como, Italy, 1985, *Lecture Notes Math.* **1206** (1986) 61-108.

[2] D. L. Burkholder, Explorations in martingale theory and its applications, École d' Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX-1983, *Lecture Notes Math.***1464** (1991) 1-66.

[3] A. Korenovskii, Mean Oscillations and Equimeasurable Rearrangements of Dunctions, *Lecture Notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana*, Springer 2007.

[4] A. Melas, The Bellman functions of dyadic-like maximal operators and related inequalities. *Adv. in Mathematics* **192** (2005) 310-340.

[5] G. Wang, Sharp maximal inequalities for conditionally symmetric martingales and Brownian motion. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **112** (1991) 579-586.